

Lincoln. p. 68. p. 81. p. 89.

VOL. XX

No. 2

THE
MAGAZINE OF HISTORY

WITH
NOTES AND QUERIES

Americanus sum: Americani nihil a me alienum puto

FEBRUARY, 1915

WILLIAM ABBATT

20 LIBERTY ST., POUGHKEEPSIE, N. Y.

AND

28 WEST ELIZABETH ST., TARRYTOWN, N. Y.

Published Monthly

\$5.00 a Year

50 Cents a Number

THE MAGAZINE OF HISTORY

WITH NOTES AND QUERIES

Vol. XX

FEBRUARY, 1915

No. 2

CONTENTS

SOME PUBLIC SERVICES OF WASHINGTON, COMMONLY OVER-LOOKED . . .	W. SCOTT, Sec. <i>International Education Conference</i>	51
THE FIGHT FOR OLD MONADNOCK . . .	ALLEN CHAMBERLAIN	57
THE <i>CONSTITUTION</i> ,—THE LAST OF THE "OLD NAVY"	CHARLES NEVERS HOLMES	62
✓ LINCOLN AND McCLELLAN	F. E. L.	68
PERSONAL REMINISCENCES OF THE REBELLION (<i>Fifteenth Paper</i>)	COLONEL LE GRAND B. CANNON	72
WASHINGTON'S ENGLISH CONNECTIONS	A. C. C.	77
✕ LINCOLN GENEALOGICAL NOTES	{ S. L. K. } { W. W. }	81
THE GERMAN-DUTCH BRANCH OF THE WASHINGTON FAMILY	GUIDO BRUNO	83
✓ LINCOLN AS A POLITICIAN		89
THE TRENT AFFAIR	(<i>The late</i>) CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS	90

Entered as second-class matter March, 1, 1905, at the Post Office at Poughkeepsie, N. Y. Act of Congress, March 3, 1870.



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2012 with funding from
The Institute of Museum and Library Services through an Indiana State Library LSTA Grant

THE MAGAZINE OF HISTORY

WITH NOTES AND QUERIES

VOL. XX

FEBRUARY, 1915

No. 2

GEORGE WASHINGTON: SOME GREAT PUBLIC SERVICES COMMONLY OVERLOOKED

IT is said that one who digs into the ruins of a Greek city may find a piece of statuary, a fragment of a vase, a gem or other object of artistic skill. If the antiquary unearths a Roman site, he may come upon a broken sword, a piece of armor or other implement of war. Some pre-eminent national quality gives a people its place in history. The Greek led in art and kindred attainments; the Roman in war and government. A closer survey shows that with a dominant quality others are associated, and a nation's pre-eminence rests on a combination of traits as a basis. The Greek excelled not only in art and letters; he was also skilful in politics and commerce, a colonizer, a versatile genius never surpassed. The Roman stands out as a world-soldier, but in law, government and other spheres he has a large part in civilization, sometimes as imitator or borrower and often as an original force. The dominant trait, however, writes its mark on history.

The same principle is illustrated in historic personalities, founders of states, soldiers, men of letters, lawgivers, moral leaders. Moses, Homer, Cæsar, Charlemagne, Luther, Loyola, Michael Angelo, Napoleon, suggest at once a unique character, yet each may have given a manysided service to his age. Genius is sometimes defined as human energy, turned now in one, and again in another channel, so that a man distinguished in one age in war, might in another age become a statesman, moral reformer, or a historic figure in other areas.

Washington has been named by common consent the "Father of his Country". He belongs among the founders of states, an order of men which some thinkers consider the highest. In the founding and building of a state the problems of human diversity can not be evaded, but they must be brought into practical unity to keep the state from repression on the one hand and disintegration on the other. High

intellectual and moral qualities joined to practical wisdom and energy are indispensable to such leaders of men.

The life of Washington has features, often obscured or overlooked because his fame rests rather on a combination of qualities, a harmony of powers. He was remarkable for symmetry and poise of character. Bancroft ascribes to him common sense or reflective judgment combined with creative and executive capacity. Patrick Henry said: "For sound judgment Washington is unquestionably the greatest man on the floor" (of the Continental Congress). He looms up as on the whole the most dependable man of his country, and perhaps of his age.

The features of Washington's career, comparatively overlooked, are, however, evidences of his broad intelligence and manysided experience. They form part of the basis of his great fame.

Let us view Washington first as a promoter of scientific agriculture. It will be remembered that he was a rich man by inheritance and his wealth was further increased by marriage. He was a large landowner. At his death his estate was scheduled at \$530,000 and included over 46,000 acres of land. He ranked among the wealthiest men of his country. For twenty years after 1755 he was a farmer or planter, a pursuit more congenial to him than military or official life. He corresponded with gentlemen in America and Europe on agricultural subjects. Among his writings is found one with the title, "Washington, G. Letters to Arthur Young. Account of his husbandry, with map of his farm; his opinions on various questions in agriculture, and many particulars of the rural economy of the United States. London, 1801." A pamphlet (72 pages) was published by Dr. J. M. Toner in 1892 on "Washington as an Inventor and Promoter of the Useful Arts." He followed agriculture with constant and intelligent interest. He was a good judge of land. Farm and horticultural problems occupied his attention during the period named; among them testing of seed, fertilization, rotation of crops, tree planting and pruning, the arboretum idea, improvement of breeds of animals. He was the first to use a pump in his region; he experimented with labor-saving machinery; tested the comparative illuminating value of spermaceti and tallow candles, and invented a plow; but his inventive talent was crowded out by public affairs. On the Mount Vernon estate many trades were carried on—blacksmithing, wagon and harnessmaking, brickmaking, carpentry, stone masonry, weaving, knitting, shoemaking, milling, etc.

At that period the farm was a centre of industry, a condition which has mostly passed away. It is obvious that with this experience Washington understood the claims of agriculture on the statesman, economist and philanthropist. Here also he discerned lines along which the nation must go forward. The movement for improved and scientific agriculture which has arisen in all progressive nations would have had in Washington an ardent friend. The historic Act of the late Senator Morrill of Vermont, which President E. Benjamin Andrews regards as one of the greatest measures in the history of education, and which founded the "land grant" colleges, one in each state, belongs to this development. Conservation of soil and forest and the various related interests, a growing element in state and national policy, may be noted in this connection. The International Chamber of Agriculture, recently established with headquarters at Rome, on the initiative of the King of Italy, prompted thereto by an American granger, David Lubin, is a step in agricultural progress which will ultimately transform the earth into a farm and garden. The extension of agricultural instruction by the "Macdonald Movement" in Canada, the school garden work which is expanding in many countries, and similar efforts to diffuse a practical knowledge of agriculture everywhere are in line with the development of the fundamental pursuit of agriculture. Here, it is evident, Washington is an up-to-date statesman. His experience and writings are inspiring and suggestive to the farmer and scientific agriculturist, and valuable to society in present day problems.

He was also a promoter of internal improvements. This was a natural result of his experience and training. He began as a surveyor of the Fairfax estate in Virginia at the age of sixteen. He later traveled extensively over the early colonies. As a military officer he was dispatched on long journeys to the northwest of the colonies. Thus both as civilian and soldier he had opportunities to study the character of the country along the coast, and to penetrate far into the interior—that is, far for the latter half of the eighteenth century. The results of this experience appear in his views as a statesman. He advocated increased facilities for intercourse between the East and West by land and water communication. He urged the construction of national highways, and surveys of western rivers. He recommended the union of the James, the Rappahannock and Ohio by canals; the commercial union of the Great Lakes, the Potomac and the sea. The latter plan was worked out later by the Erie canal and Hudson river route. His

general attitude toward highway and river improvement has been continued in the public and corporate policy of highway and railroad construction, in river and harbor improvements and international steamship lines. His liberal views on the development of means of intercommunication, which have had much to do with the progress and happiness of the nation, place him among statesmen who have aided the material advancement of modern nations. Were Washington a contemporary statesman he would doubtless regard as worthy of national and international policy such vast enterprises as transcontinental highways or railways, intercontinental lines, the Siberian, the Cape-to-Cairo, and the Australian lines, the Suez and Panama canals. The technological professions which have in recent decades expanded into many areas, would find in him a wise and energetic statesman-promoter. It is said that great men and nations have been great road-builders. Horace Bushnell has a discourse on "The Day of Roads", in which he sets forth the value of good roads and the necessity of facilities of intercommunication for the progress of society. Religious thinkers emphasize the importance in the early spread of Christianity of the Roman system of highways which joined all parts of the empire with Rome, and of the Greek language, in which the New Testament was written, as the best vehicle for the new thought, that is, there were two roads, the material highway and a well developed language, which is a road along which thought may travel. In connection with the expansion of intercommunication, a national and world wide interest, which makes all men neighbors, Washington would today rank as a world statesman.

Washington deserves a place also as a promoter of education, and, in a certain liberal sense, as an educator. We limit the idea of education in our day too much to schools and school systems, and overlook the educative processes of society, apart from or supplementary to the school. Give to education a large and reasonable interpretation, and the great leaders of the past appear as men of ample training. Both Washington and Lincoln were thus trained, probably in the best way to develop their powers. Washington left school at sixteen with enough mathematics to be a surveyor; his physical size and power were remarkable; he was a student of military tactics, agriculture, politics; an able man of business and affairs; experienced in civil and military life. His personal habits during twenty years from 1755 to the Revolution were those of a student, administrator and economizer of time, as his daily

program attests. He rose before the sun; studied, read or wrote till breakfast; after breakfast he rode about his farms (ten miles); back to study until 3 P. M. when he dined; the remainder of the day and evening was given to recreation and company; and he retired at 10 P. M. The product of his studies is found in the "Life and Writings of Washington" by Jared Sparks which comprise twelve volumes.

His practical interest in education led him also to aid young men through college, and to assist the school for indigent children at Alexandria. He gave shares in the James River company to Liberty Hall Academy, later Washington College. He devoted fifty shares of the Potomac Company to found a university at Washington under the auspices of the Government. This was the origin of the movement which continues to the present time for a national university, a favorite idea of Washington. He commended it in messages to Congress, and sets forth in his writings the advantages to the nation of the scheme.

The question of a National University is still before the American people. It has had strong advocates in and outside of Congress. In a recent year four bills were introduced in Congress on the subject, but all were open to the criticism that they were not carefully drawn, and not sufficiently representative in the administration proposed. The idea, however, has vitality, and continues in various ways to bear fruit. How to embody the idea in concrete form is a question not yet answered. American education has rested chiefly on minor civic units, as the town, county and state. A marked tendency is also manifest to supplement the local unit by the resources of a larger unit. This tendency is stronger today than in the past. The nation is assuming a greater part in educational affairs. In addition to the Federal control of education in the territories and dependencies, National educational laws, such as the Morrill Act, have been enacted, and other important measures are vigorously pressed in Congress. The Library of Congress (or Library of the United States as it should be named), the Smithsonian Institution, the departments of Education, Labor, Agriculture, and other National agencies are educational, and nation wide in their operation. Some educators believe a National university may ultimately take form in a way different from that contemplated by Washington and later advocates of the project. It may be federative, supplementary and co-operative with all existing institutions, not a distinct and central institution. Thus the fear of centralization and

interference with the genius and development of higher and general education throughout the nation may be minimized or removed. Our object, however, is to present in brief the educational service of Washington rather than to follow the fortunes of his national educational scheme. His thought was broader than the university idea; it comprised the diffusion of education among the mass of society. His plea was, to use his own words, "Promote then, as an object of primary importance, the general diffusion of knowledge." We find, therefore, in Washington, what the late Hon. W. T. Harris, United States Commissioner of Education terms, an educational statesman. Education has advanced until it is firmly fixed in the thought of all progressive nations, and is growing among backward nations. Washington saw it clearly as a national issue; contemporary statesmen and educators are viewing it as an international and world issue. Arguments which buttress education as local, state or national, apply equally to it as an international or world necessity. Movements for world wide education are now in the field. An international board of education is regarded as a practical scheme. The federation or co-operation of universities in many lands has begun in some functions. "The organization of the intelligence of mankind", as one expresses it, is steadily going forward. Washington's educational views are in harmony with the spread of education throughout the nation, and ultimately among all nations. In the advancement of this fundamental object Washington is a statesman for the future as well as for his own age. In the sweep of his influence he is here also a world statesman.

The large and varied activities of Washington embrace, as stated at the outset, many phases besides these here presented. His fame rests on the greatness and harmony of his qualities and his patriotism. The study of his richly endowed and many-sided life grows in value after the lapse of more than a century. "Go with mean people", writes Emerson, "and you think life is mean. Then read Plutarch, and the world is a proud place, peopled with men of positive quality, with heroes standing about us." Modern times have produced characters not inferior to Plutarch's ancient heroes. To this select company America has given illustrious names, and among them none higher than Washington.

W. SCOTT

BALTIMORE

THE FIGHT FOR OLD MONADNOCK.

COMMON lands are an uncommon thing this side of Old England, but New England has inherited a few through its British colonial sires. Massachusetts for example still holds the "Great Ponds," and the tidal flats, and the three thousand acres of Province lands at the tip of Cape Cod, all in common, and then there is the Common, here in our very midst, which is ours because it was held undivided by the early settlers. Up in New Hampshire there is at least one town that to this very day owns a common woodlot, whence any citizen may draw his stock of fuel without money or price. Too many of these common lands of ours have long since become alienated by hook or by crook, and largely through the heedlessness, ignorance or forgetfulness of recent generations. In the riotous development of unrestrained individualism the community's interests simply slipped from sight.

Just at the present time the Society for the Protection of New Hampshire Forests is busily engaged in establishing the public's right in a tract of 1000 acres of forest and mountain top on old Monadnock Mountain in the towns of Dublin and Jaffrey. Thirty years ago the town of Jaffrey itself bought the title to 200 acres on the mountain's crest, and much more recently the people of that town, aided by their summer visitors, bought 600 acres adjoining the town's land, and turned the title over to the State. The land that the society is now seeking to acquire abuts upon these pieces at the top of the mountain, and lies over the crest on the north, or Dublin side. It embraces one of the most beautiful sections of the old mountain, including the rocky side and the timbered slopes of the great northeast shoulder.

When those hill towns were allotted, which was a little more than a century ago, these higher slopes were held as common lands to the then proprietors of the lowland farms. The higher lands were not of much value. Two forest fires in 1804 and 1820 bared the summit of its trees, and the elements saw to it that the soil did not long remain thereafter. What timber was left on the pitches below the rocks was small and difficult to get, and so not tempting. But times have changed. The pulp man does not despise small timber, and it pays to get it from the most inaccessible of situations. Moreover people of wealth have marked that region as a desirable one for their summer homes, and the creation of large forest estates is in steady progress.

In this particular case the title to those lands did not vest in the corporate community, as did that to Boston Common. It ran in undivided form to the individual settlers who originally owned the valley farms. It did not even pass from them with any transfer of those farms, unless so specifically expressed by deed, but remained with those original proprietors, "their heirs and assigns forever." Sound title to such old commons is not easy to acquire. The heirs are numerous and scattered, and often have no knowledge that they possess any rights whatsoever. The game of the covetous is, therefore, to gain a vested right based upon some indefinite quitclaim, or through a squatter's sovereignty.

Such claims have been asserted on these Monadnock lands, and it is this encroachment that the forestry society disputes, that the forest may not be stripped to the mutilation of this noted landscape, or the public be fenced out from a beloved recreation field by some magnate's park. The lumbermen have been enjoined, and the society proposes to hold the tract, subject only to the ruling of the courts as to the final disposition and ownership of these wild public lands. To do this in behalf of the public the society itself has had to acquire titles direct from the heirs of the old Masonian proprietors, as the early grantees were called, and up to date it has succeeded in recording deeds signed by a large majority of these heirs.

In this the society is doing for that section of New Hampshire the very sort of service that James Bryce and Shaw Lefevre did for England when they organized the "Commons and Footpaths Society" nearly fifty years ago. Everywhere in the kingdom the great landed proprietors, acting under the authority of a law enacted in their interest way back in the time of Henry III, were seizing common lands and enclosing them for private use. After many years of untiring and ceaseless effort, involving expensive litigation against some of the most powerful landowners of their country, and repeated attempts to secure remedial legislation from the Parliament, they succeeded in stopping the practice, and in firmly establishing the public's rights beyond all peradventure. The history of this battle is most fascinatingly told by Lord Eversley in his "Commons, Forests and Footpaths."

Not long before James Bryce retired from his ambassadorial post at Washington he spoke there on the need of conserving this country's beauty spots in the interest of the future. What he then said by way

of argument and advice was apposite and indicates why the New Hampshire society is so vigorously engaged in defending the Monadnock region from encroachment. The pith of Mr. Bryce's remarks on that occasion is found in these words:

The population of the world goes on constantly increasing, and nowhere increasing so fast as in North America. A taste for natural beauty is increasing, and, we hope, will go on increasing. The places of scenic beauty do not increase, but, on the contrary, are in danger of being reduced in number and diminished in quantity, and the danger is always increasing with the accumulation of wealth, owing to the desire of private persons to appropriate these places. There is no better service we can render to the masses of the people than to set about and preserve for them wide spaces of fine scenery for their delight. From these propositions I draw the conclusion that it is necessary to save what we have got, and to extend the policy which you have wisely adopted, by acquiring and preserving still further areas for the perpetual enjoyment of the people.

GOOD WORK FOR NEW HAMPSHIRE FORESTS

Through such activities as these the society is demonstrating that, although it is supremely concerned in the development of the commercial forests of the State, it is not unmindful of the economic importance of the purely beautiful or recreational elements of the problem, a phase which too many conservation prophets are prone to ignore. It has not only done a lion's share in wringing from Congress the means for setting up a national forest in the White Mountains, but it has induced the people of its own State to see the wastefulness of forest fires and to fight against it through an efficient State forest service. That forest service and the society work shoulder to shoulder for everything to forward better commercial forests, but the society has to take care of the other little matters by itself.

That this work is appreciated is amply proved by the generous support with which its every appeal is met by the citizens, summer residents, and by many an emigrated son of the State, and in one form or another many a voluntary contribution comes its way. One of the latest in this latter category is the gift to the public of the wooded borders of a stretch of State highway, three-quarters of a mile in

length. Two summer residents of Tamworth, Charles P. Bowditch of Boston and John S. Runnells of Chicago, were the benefactors in this case, giving to the society in trust title to the strips all along this road, one hundred and twenty-five feet deep on either side, amounting to about two hundred acres of forest land.

That communal woodlot in a New Hampshire town, to which a passing allusion has been made, is a most interesting example of the socialism of the early settlers, born of the doctrine of commonage brought with them from the mother country. The well-known town of Conway, in the White Mountains, is the proud possessor of this property. Six thousand acres in extent, it lies in a broad stretch across the Green Hills and Rattlesnake Mountain, that minor range that rises just east of the villages in the very heart of the township. This is beyond a doubt, so competent legal authorities confidently assert, a true example of a town-owned forest to which all citizens of this or any other day have rights by mere virtue of their citizenship, and subject only to such control and regulation as they themselves may from time to time prescribe as burghers and joint proprietors.

Unhappily those commons, once so handsomely and richly wooded, have been used by the commoners according to the American idea of unrestricted individualism—first come first served, and posterity go hang. The timber as well as the fuel wood has been cut wholly without regard to the future—for what did the owners know or care about forestry? Fires of course followed unrestrained upon the heels of the choppers, and the soil, in many parts, was wholly consumed or washed away, leaving the hills more picturesque in their granite nakedness, but barren and unproductive where once grew forest. On the more remote sections considerable areas of hardwood timber even now remain, but this will not be for long if the wholly unregulated cutting is continued. The town should be awakened to the present and potential value of this property. So intelligent a community as that of Conway needs but to be shown that to put that forest under proper management and regulation is really in the interest of the commoners, and in no sense an infringement of their rights.

There is need for the immediate reforestation of portions of the tract. For the town to undertake this work of restoration and improvement would be a large task, but in view of the present attitude of the State as a whole toward the conservation of its forest wealth, as

shown by its recent legislation, it is not improbable that the active co-operation of the State's forest service could readily be secured, were the town to seek such aid. This is Conway's opportunity to make itself noteworthy in the best sense of the word. The town needs but to realize that in this public forest it has a property equal in extent with that which the State has itself just purchased in the adjacent Crawford Notch. The acquisition of that forest cost the State \$100,000. For timber-growing purposes the town's six thousand acres are equally good at least, and they do not stand the community a cent. Whatever is done the ancient privilege of commonage should be continued under State and town co-operation.

BOSTON

ALLEN CHAMBERLIN



THE "CONSTITUTION," THE LAST OF THE "OLD NAVY"

NAVAL warfare has changed almost incomparably since the beginning of the nineteenth century. A "dreadnought" has a displacement of 20,000 tons, more or less, and carries 12-inch guns. About 1800 such a warship as the *Constitution* had a displacement of 1,576 tons and carried forty-four guns, which hurled in all only a total weight of about seven hundred pounds of projectiles. The cost of the *Constitution* was, compared with the cost of constructing our modern dreadnoughts, very small, \$302,719. She had a large crew, however, nearly 400 men.

American commerce was preyed upon by pirates of the Barbary States on the African coast of the Mediterranean, about the beginning of the nineteenth century. To protect this commerce an Act was passed by the third Congress to purchase or build six warships. A result of this Act was the construction in Boston of the famous *Constitution*, whose keel was laid in November, 1794. The building of the ship was intrusted to Mr. Hartt who was one of a family of famous shipbuilders, under the careful oversight of Colonel George Claghorn of New Bedford. The plans were drawn by Joshua Humphries of Philadelphia, assisted by certain naval officers. In connection with the construction of this famous warship, her copper bolts were supplied by Paul Revere, her gun-carriages were made by Ephraim Thayer, her sails in the old Granary near the present corner of Tremont and Park Streets, Boston, and the anchors were made in Hanover, Massachusetts. Her frame was of live oak.

Regarding the figure-head of the *Constitution*, this was at first a representation of Hercules with an uplifted club, which was carved by the Skillings of Boston. The figure was afterwards shot away in an engagement before Tripoli, and in 1812 was replaced by a figure-head representing Neptune. Later, the *Constitution* carried a simple billet-head scroll. Afterwards a bust of General Jackson was used, and the disagreeable incidents resulting from the use of it will be described later.

Colonel Claghorn announced that the *Constitution* would be launched on September 20, 1797, about three years after the laying of the keel; but the attempt proved a failure. On the 22nd a second at-

tempt was made which was also unsuccessful. These two failures caused more or less superstitious comment. People even went as far as to predict that the ship would be "ill-fated". But on October 21st, at 12.30 P. M., all was in readiness for a third attempt. It was high tide, a cloudy and chilly day. Owing to the two previous failures only a few people gathered to see the launching. But this time the warship slid into the water, Commodore James Sever naming her with a bottle of old Madeira wine, provided by Hon. Thomas Russell out of his private store. The third launching was successful; but the *Constitution* did not move under her sails until about nine months later.

With respect to the first hoisting of the American flag over the *Constitution*, the following is both interesting and amusing. It is taken from Preble's "History of the Flag". "We are glad to be able to record the name of the person who first hoisted our flag over her, little imagining the glorious history she would make. When the *Constitution* was about ready to launch, Commodore Nicholson, who had charge and superintendence of her construction, left the shipyard to get his breakfast, leaving express orders not to hoist any flag over her until his return, intending to reserve the honor to himself. Among the workmen upon her was a shipwright and calker named Samuel Bentley, who, with the assistance of another workman named Harris, bent on and hoisted the Stars and Stripes during the Commodore's absence. When the Commodore returned and saw our flag, contrary to his orders, floating over her, he was very wrathful, and expressed himself in words more strong than polite to the offending workmen."

The initial voyage of the *Constitution* took place on July 20, 1798, putting out to sea on August 13th. Her first two cruises under Commodores Nicholson and Talbot were uninteresting, and it was not until Edward Preble was in command of her in the Mediterranean that she fired her first broadside. Preble hoisted his flag over her on May 21, 1803, caused her to be thoroughly overhauled, and sailed for the Mediterranean, August 14th. Then she took part in the operations against the Barbary pirates and in the bombardment of Tripoli (August-September, 1804).

But her real fame began when she was commanded by the famous Isaac Hull. The Second War with Great Britain had begun, and, on July 12, 1812, Hull attempted to join the New York squadron of ships, but was prevented by a British fleet—which included the *Guerrière*—

escaping from it after a remarkable chase of three nights and two days. Of course, as most of us know, this escape was greatly assisted by Hull's use of "umbrellas", which were made of strong spars attached to a central one, just like a huge umbrella-frame. This frame was covered with canvas, and could be opened or closed. The "Umbrella" was towed out some distance by boats, and, being attached to the *Constitution* by stout ropes, and being also sunk in the water, was an excellent means for aiding the escape of the ship, by the crew pulling the vessel up to it. But, anyway, luck or otherwise, the *Constitution* got away from her pursuers, arriving in Marblehead harbor on Sunday.

Then, the *Constitution* took a grand revenge. The navy department had about decided to replace Hull in command of the ship, by William Bainbridge and sent word to Hull to remain in Boston Harbor until further orders; but he, foreseeing what was coming, did not wait. He left Boston on August 2nd, and sailed for the Bay of Fundy in search of prizes. Then he made for the Bermudas, and, on the 19th, about one hundred miles east of Boston, he met the *Guerrière*, one of the ships that had chased him into Marblehead. Both Hull and Captain Dacres who commanded the *Guerrière* were eager for a fight. The *Constitution* had at that time fifty-five guns which threw about 700 pounds of projectiles, and a crew of 468, while the *Guerrière* had forty-nine guns carrying about 597 pounds, and a crew of 263. After manoeuvring a while for position, the *Constitution* steered straight for the enemy, receiving her full fire. When his ship was only forty yards away, Hull discharged a whole broadside at the *Guerrière*, with terrible effect. Soon the enemy's mainyard was shot away and her rigging, sails and hull badly damaged. After this the *Constitution* poured two fearful broadsides into her. Both British and Americans wished to board, but the state of the sea prevented. At last the *Guerrière* surrendered, in such a battered condition that Hull was obliged to blow her up. The length of this historic fight was less than half an hour, during which the *Constitution* lost seven killed and seven wounded, and the *Guerrière*, fifteen killed and sixty-three wounded.

Respecting this sea-battle the following quotation may here be inserted. "What a scene was presented, and how changed in so short a time, during which the *Guerrière* had been totally dismasted and otherwise cut to pieces, so as not to make her worth towing into port. On the other hand, the *Constitution* looked perfectly fresh, and even those

on board the *Guerrière* did not know what ship had fought them. Captain Dacres stood with his officers surveying the scene—all in the most perfect astonishment." And, the small damage received by the *Constitution* during this battle won for her the name of "Old Ironsides".

William Bainbridge was the next commander of the *Constitution*. He began a cruise against the British commerce in the West Indies. On December 29, 1812, the *Constitution* had her hard-fought battle with the *Java*, off the coast of Brazil. At that time she had fifty-four guns, firing 787 pounds of metal, and a crew of 480, while the *Java* had forty-seven guns, firing 568 pounds, and a crew of 426. It was indeed a very fierce naval fight, the Americans winning by superior gunnery. Bainbridge himself was wounded, and Lambert, the commander of the *Java*, fatally so. The *Java* surrendered but in such a condition that like the *Guerrière* she had to be blown up. She lost sixty killed and one hundred and one wounded, while the *Constitution* lost nine killed and twenty-five wounded. After the battle the *Constitution* sailed for Boston to be repaired; but Boston Harbor was closely watched by the British fleet, and she was obliged to remain there in port until New Year's Day, 1814.

Once more the ship—this time under command of Captain Charles Stewart—left Boston to fight the enemy. Again she sailed for the West Indies, and captured there four prizes, a total of twenty-four guns and seventy-six men. Being once more blockaded by a British fleet, she did not escape until December 17, 1814. As he was sailing towards the Madeiras, on February 20, 1815, Captain Stewart met two British war vessels, the *Cyane* and the *Levant*, with respectively thirty-four and twenty-one guns. Stewart's seamanship was superb, the *Cyane* was captured, and the *Levant*, also, after being overtaken in its flight by the *Constitution*. In this remarkable sea fight, the two ships of the enemy had thirty-five killed and forty-two wounded, while the *Constitution* had four killed and ten wounded.

This battle ended in a blaze of glory the great sea fights of the *Constitution*. Henceforth "Old Ironsides" was to be a ship of peace and history. But there was still a battle to be waged over her. This was the decided unpleasantness about the Jackson figure-head.

The General had most bitter personal and political enemies. When it was reported in Boston that the famous ship, in which its

citizens were so deeply interested, was to be adorned with the bust of Andrew Jackson, there was no slight disturbance. And the excitement grew. The carver of the bust was Laban S. Beecher, and it is reported that large bribes were offered him to destroy the figure-head on which he was working. The excitement became so intense that Commodore Elliott thought it prudent to remove both figure-head and artist to the protection of the Navy Yard, where Beecher finished his work at his leisure. The figure represented Jackson holding in his hand a scroll with the motto, "The Union—it must be preserved." The completed bust was placed on the stem of the *Constitution*; but on the 3rd of July, 1834, was discovered to have lost its head. This "accident" occurred during a violent thunderstorm, and although there was a sentinel close at hand the executioner was not known until some time afterwards. The doer of the deed was a certain Captain Dewey, a Boston shipmaster, who reached the *Constitution* in a small rowboat, and beheaded the General with a saw, being obliged to cut through a copper bolt to accomplish his purpose.

Although "Old Ironsides" was in considerable danger of destruction at different times from British warships, it was in the greatest peril of its existence in 1830. The famous vessel was condemned to be broken up; but was saved by the brilliant poem by Oliver Wendell Holmes. Since that time her life has not been threatened, although at the outbreak of the Rebellion she was in some danger at Annapolis, Md.

In 1833, she was taken into the new dry dock at Charlestown in the presence of Vice-President Van Buren and other high officials. The famous ship was then completely dismasted and dismantled, and rebuilt by Josiah Barker, a noted naval constructor of that day. In March, 1835, thus repaired and rebuilt, sailed again for the Mediterranean, from New York, as the flag-ship of Commodore Elliott. In 1855 she was laid up at the Portsmouth navy yard, and was later used as quarters for the midshipmen at Newport and Annapolis. In 1871 she was taken to Philadelphia and again laid up. In 1877 she was once more repaired and rebuilt, and the following year made her last voyage across the Atlantic. In 1897 "Old Ironsides" was "roofed in" at Charlestown, where she lies today, being used as a receiving ship and for other minor purposes.

Thus, the good ship was launched, became famous, and is enjoying her placid old age in the waters of Boston Harbor. Her keel was laid in 1794 and it still rests off Charlestown's shore in 1915. Her commanders were all brave and skillful sailors, but then the ship herself was a most noble one. During her existence our country has become vast and prosperous, and "Old Ironsides" will live amid even a greater generation of American citizens. She is part of the glorious history of our Republic, an honored and treasured heritage of the times and men that made our Nation what it is today.

CHARLES NEVERS HOLMES

BOSTON

LINCOLN AND McCLELLAN

LOOKING back over the records of the Civil War, and noting the constant clash of policies and politics, of opinions and ambitions, which marked its course, one is sometimes tempted to wonder, not so much that it was brought to a close in four years, as that it ever ended at all in a victory for the Union arms. President Lincoln, who stood at the focal point where all the lines crossed, must have suffered a terrible tax not only on his patriotism and his patience, but on his diplomatic resourcefulness as well. As we commonly have him represented to us, it is the modest, but ultimately triumphant, overcomer of obstacles. But the war era bore for him also its crop of humiliations; and one of the most serious of these occurred in the fall of 1862, when, in order to assure the safety of the national capital, he had to bow his head to a military man whom he had practically retired from active service because of their disagreements.

All through the earlier part of the year, the President, Secretary Stanton, and Generals Halleck and McClellan had kept up a fire of missives of remonstrance and rebuke. Back of the Administration was a press eager for thrilling news and a public which knew as little of war, for the most part, as of the differential calculus, and whose one idea of an army was a body of men equipped with weapons of various sorts, who could march and fight without food or sleep, if need be, for an indefinite period. Many enthusiastic patriots were sure that the war had already lasted twice as long as was necessary. Under goading from these sources, the President and his Secretary of War, however well they might understand the reasons for McClellan's deliberateness, felt themselves forced to urge him on, lest the support of the people of the North who were recruiting the volunteer regiments, and of the men of means who were financing the Government's operations should weaken through lack of confidence. McClellan kept insisting on more troops, and more time to get them ready for effective action. But the clamor was so great that the President, on at least one occasion, after convening a council of war and finding that twelve of the twenty officers composing it agreed with McClellan, threw overboard their decision and issued peremptory orders himself in defiance thereof. Sometimes the correspondence between Washington and the field became positively acrimonious, as where, after describing the slaughter at Gaines Mill, McClellan telegraphed Stanton: "Had I twenty thou-

sand, or even ten thousand, fresh troops to use tomorrow, I could take Richmond. I have lost the battle because my force was too small I am not responsible for this. If I save the army, I tell you plainly that I owe no thanks to you, or to any other person in Washington. You have done your best to sacrifice the army." Or where Halleck, after attempting to direct from Washington the movements of McClellan's subordinates in northeastern Virginia, wound up a despatch in this style: "Our people must move more actively, and find out where the enemy is. I am tired of guessing."

Meanwhile, Pope had been assigned to command all the troops gathered for the defence of Washington, which had been made into what was known as the Army of Virginia. With the end of August came also the end of his brief campaign, which he had begun with a proclamation declaring the war to have been conducted on too lenient lines and announcing that he should change all that. These utterances were interpreted as a severe reflection on McClellan, and the friends of the latter attributed them to political jealousy. With the disastrous rout at the second battle of Bull Run, Pope's pride was badly broken, and his army moved rapidly northward. The exultant Confederates prepared to threaten Washington on the west with a small force, while the main body of their army was moved up, under cover of this feint, into Maryland and Pennsylvania, to capture Philadelphia and Baltimore and descend upon Washington.

McClellan, who had been stripped of all except the outward insignia of his once high military importance, had come on to Washington, and was staying in the big brick and brownstone house which used to stand on the present site of the Shoreham Hotel, at the corner of Fifteenth and H streets. There his staff had been directed to report to him on the morning of the 2d of September. They arrived while the general was still at breakfast. Among them was John M. Wilson, now a brigadier-general, retired; at that time he was a youth of twenty-four, a lieutenant in the corps of topographical engineers attached to McClellan's staff. The officers were ushered into the room on the left of the entrance hall, opposite the parlor, and there awaited the coming of their chief. Lieutenant Wilson amused himself by looking out of the window, which commanded a view of H street for a block or so in either direction. Presently he announced to his colleagues that he had seen President Lincoln and General Halleck, general-in-chief of the

armies of the United States, walking up what is now Madison place, evidently on their way from the White House to the Arlington Hotel. It was an unusual hour for dignitaries like these to be abroad for any purpose but one of emergency, and their errand excited some curiosity among the assembled group. Another glance from the window showed that, instead of crossing to the Arlington, the two gentlemen had turned down the north side of H street and were approaching; and a moment later they ascended the steps of the McClellan house and rung the bell.

Everyone in the room was so silent that, with the door into the hall standing ajar, the officers could hear the President's inquiry for General McClellan, and the butler's response as he bowed the callers into the parlor opposite and returned to the breakfast room to announce them to his master. Wilson expected that the general would drop everything and hurry out to welcome so distinguished a brace of visitors; but he was mistaken. After the unjust treatment he felt he had received from the Administration, McClellan was in no mood for displaying any enthusiasm over this morning call. He went on with his breakfast, doubtless doing a great deal of thinking the while; and not until he had entirely finished did he rise and proceed at his ordinary pace to the parlor.

None of the officers was disposed to eavesdropping, but the sound of the conversation in the parlor, with the alternate rise and fall of the three voices and the marked emphasis put upon one and another point under discussion, showed them that all parties engaged in it were deeply in earnest. Finally came a lull, when the tones of all dropped to the usual level, and in a few minutes the general emerged with his guests, accepted and shook with apparent cordiality their proffered hands, and held the door open for them to depart. Then, walking into the room where his staff were waiting, with a look of serious satisfaction on his face but in a quiet tone, he said:

"Gentlemen, I have just been assigned by the President to the command of the united armies for the defence of Washington."

This announcement he followed with instructions to the several officers before him. To Wilson fell the task of going out into Virginia to convey to Pope the news of his supersession. He rode nearly to Fairfax Court House before coming up with the defeated officer. Pope

was naturally chagrined at the intelligence, but received it without audible comment. McClellan assumed command at once, and entered upon the campaign which culminated in the battle of Manassas and his final retirement from the centre of the martial stage a few weeks later.

The incident is still a vivid picture in the memory of General Wilson, having occurred while he was at a very impressionable age; and its historical value resides in the fact that the common practice of Presidents is so different from that pursued by Mr. Lincoln. The usual preliminary to a conference between a President and one of his subordinates is a message requesting the presence of the latter at the White House, where it is the President who keeps him waiting, not he the President. General McClellan was too generous-minded a man ever to gloat over his triumph, and too good a custodian of confidences to prate of what occurred at that interview in the H street parlor; but, later events gave a cue to indicate that in the little while he sat at his breakfast table while his two superiors in office cooled their heels in an outer room, he turned over in his mind the possible purpose of their visit and decided upon the terms he was to exact of them as an element in his impending vindication.

F. E. L.

PERSONAL REMINISCENCES OF THE REBELLION

(Fifteenth Paper)

THE UNION LEAGUE CLUB AND THE REBELLION

PREVIOUS to this, Massachusetts had organized the first negro regiment, the Fifty-fourth Massachusetts; it was mustered into the service by General Wool, at Readville, Massachusetts, and as the state authorities were advised by the loyal authorities of New York that it would not be safe to let it pass through New York City, it was therefore sent forward by sea direct.

Connecticut had also commenced to enlist negro troops to fill its quota. Governor Seymour, of New York, had done nothing of the kind, and would only enlist whites.

The Union League Club of New York had passed a resolution to take measures to promote enlistments, and a committee was appointed, with power to carry the resolution into effect. Colonel George Bliss, Mr. Jackson S. Schultz, Mr. Alexander Van Rensselaer, two other gentlemen, and myself were appointed on the Committee. The Committee met and determined to establish recruiting stations, and, further, decided to give, in addition to the bounties given by the city and State, an additional fifty dollars for every person enlisted as a recruit in the United States Army.

This bounty system had been very pernicious in its workings, and was degenerating the whole military service. Not a few men had made practically a profession of enlisting to get these bounties and then deserting, and repeating the operation from State to State. It was demoralizing the whole volunteer service of the country. I objected at the moment to voting the bounty, urging that the whole system was demoralizing because it was destroying all patriotic feeling and sentiment, and was degrading the whole army into a mercenary service. Yet here we were having able-bodied negroes, who owed a service to this State, taken out of our State and filling the quotas in other States more advanced in their views. We should, I urged, proceed to raise a regiment of black troops. After some time the Committee came over to my views, and it was determined to apply at once to Governor Seymour for authority to raise a regiment of negro troops; but he refused permission.

Colonel Bliss and I then applied to the Secretary of War on behalf of the State, for authority to raise a regiment of regular colored troops. He was disposed to refuse the request, on the ground that if New York was so stupid as to insist that none but white men should fill her quota, he would let other States come in and take the negroes away from us. When we brought it to the attention of Secretary Stanton that continued refusal of this request to the great loyal body of the Union League Club, whose members were the strongest supporters the Government had in any city, both with men and money, would alienate an aid in support of the nation which he could little afford to lose, he, being finally convinced of our position, issued the authorization.

Our proposition was ridiculed in the disloyal newspapers, but we raised a regiment, the Twentieth United States Regiment of colored troops, of a thousand men, in fifteen days. We then determined to correct public opinion, and decided that this regiment should march through the streets of New York, to embark, as a vindication of the laws of the nation, and as showing to the people of the world that we had not only put down the rioting, but at the same time had elevated the negroes. It was further determined that we should still further popularize this act by having the most distinguished women in New York present to the regiment a set of colors. And perhaps no other regiment enlisted into the service of the United States had such magnificent colors as was presented by the ladies of New York to the Twentieth Regiment of United States colored troops. Mrs. John Jacob Astor was the chairman of the Committee.

It was further determined that these troops should land from Randall's Island at the foot of Twenty-sixth Street, on the East River, and march through the very district where the mob had been most violent during the draft riots, to Union Square, in front of the Club house, where the colors were to be presented. We applied to every bandmaster in New York to furnish a band to lead the regiment, and they all refused. We then got an order from the Government that the Regular Army band on Governor's Island should be sent for the purpose, and this band came over. The negro regiment had merely a drum corps of negro boys and a few buglers.

The band met the regiment at the corner of Twenty-sixth Street and Fourth Avenue. An immense crowd was following them. The troops were furnished with forty rounds of ammunition and their guns

were charged, and they had instructions that if they were assaulted they were immediately to shoot down all who opposed them. They marched to the point mentioned above, and were halted there to meet the band. It was a very bad place to halt, as part of the troops were in one street and part in another. The Colonel recognized this fact and gave the order to move. The bandmaster asked what he should play. "Play anything!" said the colonel, and the band struck up some foreign air, and the black soldiers started off and the march was continued without mishap.

When the presentation of colors was made in front of the Union League Club-house, there was a splendid display there of the very best element of New York society. After the presentation the troops started for the place of embarkation, with three hundred and fifty members of the club marching in front of the regiment. The enthusiasm was unbounded. Not a word or sound was uttered or a gesture made but of praise and applause. The march was a triumphant procession, and the enthusiasm was kept up at a wonderful pitch all the way to the foot of Canal Street, where the regiment embarked on a ship and went to Florida.

The club then raised two other colored regiments, until finally there was scarcely an able-bodied negro of military age living in the State of New York that had not been mustered into the service of the United States.

Thus was the loyalty of New York City vindicated, and thereafter the loyal sentiment was dominant until the close of the war.

In the fall of 1863 General Wool was retired from the Army of the United States under the laws which governed the period of service. He returned to his home at Troy, and died in the year 1869. After his retirement I left the service finally, but continued in private life as an active member of the Union League Club, whose great duty was to sustain the Government in every act for maintaining the integrity of the nation.

The services of the club in this regard were almost inestimable.

The origin of the organization of the Union League Club was somewhat peculiar and significant. On the breaking out of the war, as has been said, a large part of the influential sentiment of the city, in busi-

ness and finance, was either disloyal or timid. The Union Club, which represented more than any other similar organization the social influence of the city, was also largely doubtful or disloyal.

The late Judah P. Benjamin was a member of the club, and immediately after secession he became the rebel Attorney-General, and later rebel Secretary of War. His club dues lapsed through his absence at the South, and three members of the club, Mr. Samuel L. M. Barlow, Mr. William R. Travers, and Mr. Augustus Schell, paid his dues, although this was a Union club and he a rebel in arms against the United States. This act produced great indignation in the minds of the loyal men in the club. Mr. Alfred Craven, Chief Engineer of the city, a Virginian by birth, was so indignant at this act that he denounced it in unmeasured terms. His action became known to these three gentlemen, and they resented it.

One day shortly afterward they were in the general club-room, with a great many other members, and were naturally smarting under Mr. Craven's criticisms, and were talking about the matter, when they observed Mr. Craven walking across Twenty-first Street, on his way to the club-house. They all three rushed out of the club-house and met him in the street, saying:

"Mr. Craven, we hear you have spoken with great disrespect of us, in criticising our action in paying Mr. Benjamin's club dues. We want an explanation."

"Gentlemen," said Mr. Craven, "we are in the street here, but if I have said anything that is not justifiable I will make explanation if you will walk with me to the club."

They all walked into the general club-room, where a great number of the members were assembled, everybody expecting a scene. Mr. Craven said:

"Gentlemen, I have spoken of this matter publicly, and if I have done wrong I must make an apology publicly. What do you complain of?"

"You have criticised our having paid this gentleman's dues," said one of the three gentlemen.

"Yes, sir," replied Mr. Craven; "and I repeat it again. He is a rebel in arms against the United States, and this is a Union club. He

never was fit to have been a member of this club under any conditions. He never was a gentleman. More than that, he was a thief, and a dirty thief. I was at school with him. If any of you gentlemen take exception to what I say, I am at your service. ”

There was not any one of them ready to take exception; but the matter was taken up by some seventy of us, and we resigned from the Union Club. We would not compromise our self-respect by any such association. From this incident chiefly resulted the formation of the Union League Club, which became the most powerful volunteer organization there was in this country. It had an influence for supplying the Government with money and credit which no other organization had. It was unstinted in its loyal exertions. It brought together the presidents of banks, trust companies, and other financial institutions, who rendered the Government and the Union cause the greatest of service; for there was a period when the Government's funds and credit wanted a great deal more recruiting than the army did. These gentlemen took a broad view of the situation, knowing that if the public credit was gone private credit would soon go also, and they gave the Government every support in its times of greatest need. By their acts and influence, being the representatives of the moneyed powers of this city, loans were made to the Government, and what was done here gave credit and confidence to the moneyed interests of the whole country.

The club never faltered in its services, the Government was never without its support, and the amount of unselfish work done by its members was hardly to be estimated. It is that fact that has given the Union League Club such great influence, and deservedly so, in public affairs from that time to this.

LE GRAND B. CANNON

(To be continued)

WASHINGTON'S CONNECTIONS WITH SELBY, ENGLAND

The following letters from the late Rev. George Miller to the Stratford-on-Avon *Herald* may prove of interest in connection with this reference, and be thus more permanently recorded. The writer died on Dec. 28, 1909, having been vicar of Radway, Warwickshire, for forty-nine years. He was the author among other works, of "Rambles Round the Edge Hills" (1900), but his "Extended Rambles Over the Edge Hills," advertised in the book referred to, was never published.

A. C. C.

THE EDGEHILLS AND THE FAMILY OF GEORGE WASHINGTON

IT will interest our readers, and, perhaps, more than others, our cousins across the water, to know how intimately this district was connected in years gone by with the family of the great George Washington.

The house and estate of Radway Grange was purchased, 1553, by Walter Light, armiger of Haise, near Brackley, a near neighbor of the Washingtons of Sulgrave. The intimacy between the two families was drawn very close when Robert Washington of Sulgrave married Alice, only daughter of the said Walter Light, who settled his estate at Radway on Walter, the third son of his daughter Alice. Walter died in his grandfather's lifetime, so that Mr. Washington, her grandson Walter, succeeded to the Radway property in the year 1599. His son John succeeded him.

In the Radway *Register* there are several entries relative to the children of this John Washington, and in the church, on an old flat stone, there was the following inscription, now almost entirely obliterated:

Here lies a bud, being forward come.
Was nipt by death ere it could bloome.

John Washington, he died the 5th of November, his age was 2 years 3 months. A. D. 1619.

About the year 1650 John Washington sold his estate to William Goodwin, whose family were large landed proprietors in the shires of Warwick and Oxford, when he disappears entirely, probably migrating, with other members of his family, to the New World.

Warwickshire has, therefore, a close connection with the great American President. His ancestress, a wife of Robert of Sulgrave, was a Warwickshire heiress, the only daughter of the owner of Radway Grange.

The Warwickshire branch of his family continued in the position of landowners for a generation beyond the elder one of Sulgrave. What, however, became of John of Radway, after he sold his estate is really a matter of conjecture. At one time it seemed probable that he was the missing link required in George Washington's pedigree. The claims of other members of the family have of late years been put forward with more or less success. Whether really conclusive evidence will be forthcoming is doubtful.

WASHINGTON ENTRIES IN A RADWAY REGISTER 1601 TO 1701

1615. Walter Washington, sonn of John Washington, gent., of this towne, and parish, and of the parish of Itchington Epi, was baptised heer the 28th day of December, *anno ut supra*.

1617. John Washington, sonn of John Washington, gent., of this towne, and parish of Itchington Episcopi, was baptised on the 8th day of September, *anno ut supra*.

1618. George Washington, sonn of John Washington, and Ann his wife, of this towne, but of the parish of Byshopes Itchington, was baptised the 8th day of June, *ano P. dicto*.

1621. Elizabeth, daughter of John Washington, of the parish of Itchington Episcopi, was baptised here the last day of March, *ano P. dicto*.

1622. Marie Washington, of this town, but of the parish of Itchington Episcopi, was baptised at home the 2 day of February, *anno ut supra*.

1626. Alice Washington, daughter of John Washington and Anne, his wife, of this towne, but of the parish of Itchington Episci, was baptised here the tenth day of September, *anno pdia*.

1628. Thomas Washington, sonne of John Washington, and Anne his wife, of this towne, but of ye parish of Itchington Episci, was baptised ye one and twentieth day of June, *anno ut supra*.

1631. Katherine Washington, daughter of John Washington and Anne his wife, of this towne, but of the parish of Itchington Ep., was baptised here the seventh day of March, *anno ut supra*.

BURIALS

John Washington, sonn of John Washington, of this towne and of the parish of Itchington, Episci, was buried the 26th day of November, 1629.

Marie Washington, daughter of John Washington and Anne his wife, of this town but of the parish of Itchington Episci, was buried the last day of March, 1628.

Alice Washington, daughter of John Washington, and Ann his wife, was buried the twenty-eighth day of March, *Anno Dme.*, 1634.

THE HOME OF THE ANCESTRESS OF THE GREAT GEORGE WASHINGTON

Amongst the many associations connected with the charming little village of Radway, both interesting and historical, is the connection that it had through Elizabeth Light with the direct lineage of the great George Washington. Her father purchased the estate in the reign of Queen Mary, and built the old part of the house called Radway Grange. Here his daughter's girlhood and early womanhood were passed on the healthful slopes of the Edgehills, amid the natural beauties of one of the most charming specimens of English domestic scenery, till she was wooed and won by Robert Washington of Sulgrave the eldest son of Laurence, the founder of the Sulgrave branch of the Washington family. She thereby became one of the direct ancestresses of the first President of the United States.

At the time of the English Civil War the Washingtons were living at the Grange, Radway, when at the battle of Edgehill the king's centre marched down the hillside within view of the occupants of the quondam home of Elizabeth Washington. This property, however, did not remain many years longer in the hands of the Washingtons. Whether it was owing to the imposition of fines by the Parliament or to the decaying fortunes of this branch, as well as that of Sulgrave, John Washington sold his Radway estate about the year 1650. What became of him or where he lived we cannot discover, for no record of his death or burial can be found in England. It is an incident that

should not be lost sight of in connection with the Washington pedigree, that this John Washington sold Radway Grange and disappeared entirely from sight at or about the same date that John Washington, the ancestor of George, left England for America. Is it quite certain that he is not the John from whom George Washington sprung? The Radway estate seems to have been the last valuable estate that belonged in England to the Sulgrave branch of that family.

Transcript, BOSTON

A. C. C.



LINCOLN NOTES

SAMUEL (1), Mordecai (2), Mordecai (3), John (4), Abraham (5), Thomas (6), Abraham (7), President of the United States. I have not the name of the wife of John (4), but have a memorandum that he settled in Rockingham County, Va., about 1750. He was son of Mordecai (3), Lincoln and his wife, Hannah Salter, daughter of Richard Salter and Sarah Bowne. Mordecai (3) had by another wife a son, Abraham, born 1736, died 1806, member of the Pennsylvania Constitutional Convention of 1787, and of the Pennsylvania Legislature, who was the Abraham who married Ann Boone, born 1737, died 1807, a descendant of Edward Foulke, the Quaker.

Abraham (5) Lincoln went to Kentucky, 1782, and was killed by an Indian, 1784; his eldest son, Mordecai, who had been concealed behind a log, picked up his father's gun and killed the Indian. This Abraham married Mary Shipley, daughter of Robert Shipley and Sarah Rachael. She was a sister of Nancy Shipley, wife of Joseph Hanks, and their daughter, Nancy Hanks, was married by Jesse Head to Thomas Lincoln (son of Abraham (5) Lincoln and Mary Shipley), her first cousin, June 12, 1806.

Robert Shipley was of Lunenburg County, Va., 1765. Besides Mary and Nancy, above named, he had three other daughters: Elizabeth, married Thomas Sparrow; Sarah, married Robert Mitchell; Lucy, married Richard Berry. Nancy (Shipley) Hanks having died when her daughter Nancy was a little girl, the latter was brought up by her aunt, Lucy (Shipley) Berry. Joseph and Nancy (Shipley) Hanks had, besides Nancy: Thomas, Joshua, William (married Elizabeth Hall), Charles, Joseph (married Polly Young), Elizabeth (married Levi Hall) and Polly (married Jesse Friend).

Abraham (5) Lincoln had brothers: Isaac, Jacob, John and Thomas, and his sons were: Mordecai, born 1770, Josiah and Thomas (father of the President), and daughters: Mary and Nancy. John (4) Lincoln had sisters: Hannah, Ann, Sarah and Mary (married, first, Mr. Morris second, Francis Yarnell, Jr.), and brothers: Mordecai and Thomas; half brother Abraham, born 1736.

The above notes, together with some others which I have relating to the Boone family, were taken from a Lincoln scrap-book owned by

Mr. Harrison Barto of San Francisco, and I have a memorandum that the articles pasted and copied into the scrapbook by Mr. Barto, whose mother was Margaret Lincoln, 1822-1866, and her mother, Julia Ann Boone, born 1805, were: letter published by David J. Lincoln of Birdsboro, Pa., Dec. 22, 1870; article on Abraham Lincoln by Charles Carleton Coffin; article on "Daniel Boone's Home" in St. Louis Globe-Democrat, November, 1892; article by Nicholas Jones of Reading, in Berks and Schuylkill Journal, Nov. 1, 1879. And some of the above notes were from the Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography for July, 1900, page 129, in an article by the late Howard M. Jenkins on "The Mother of Lincoln"; also from the "Historical Collections of Gwynedd," by Mr. Jenkins.

S. L. K.

The authors of the new "Ancestry of Abraham Lincoln," in speaking of the pioneer, Samuel (1) Lincoln of Hingham, call attention to the fact in connection with his wife Martha, married about 1650, whose ancestry is unknown, that with her children for the first time the name Mordecai, which is later of such frequent occurrence, comes into the family. They add that this clew may be of value in determining Martha's ancestry. We are all familiar with the Mordecais in the Ellis family. Is there a family nearer Hingham with that distinctive name? The children of Samuel and Martha Lincoln, born between 1650 and 1673, were: Samuel, Daniel, two Mordecais, two Thomases, Mary, Martha, two Sarahs, and a Rebecca.

W. W.

Transcript, BOSTON

THE GERMAN-DUTCH BRANCH OF THE ORIGINAL WASHINGTON FAMILY

IT is extraordinarily strange that no one seems to know about the European branch of the Washington family, in spite of the fact that hundreds of thousands of dollars were spent by patriotic Americans to establish a family tree for the founder of the American republic.

Genealogists were sent to England to search in books and among tombstones of long-forgotten graveyards for our first President's ancestors and kin. None failed to bring home new facts and theories. Some discovered that he was a direct descendant of a family which as far back as A. D. 700, had played an important part at the courts of Anglo-Saxon Kings. Others made him the descendant of a rich and aristocratic family. But none paid attention to an entry made on the first page of George Washington's family Bible. This Bible, brought over from England by John Washington, the great-grandfather of George, contains among the entries of important events not only the birth date of James, a brother of John Washington, but also the remark that he had emigrated to the continent of Europe and founded a family of his own in Rotterdam. To follow the evolution of this family should have been equally important to the admirers of George Washington as to find a missing link between the Virginia immigrants and some noble family in England; especially as the descendants of James Washington have spread in the course of the last two centuries into four countries in Europe, producing remarkable men, honored by their contemporaries, prominent in the mercantile and financial world, as well as in the armies and navies of the Netherlands, of Germany and of Austria.

While the Dutch branch took an important part in the colonization schemes of Holland and furnished Rotterdam and other cities with burgomasters, the German and later on the Austrian Washingtons seemed to have developed the strategical and military faculties that made their famous American ancestor the first citizen of this country. Military life and romance are closely linked. And as fragrant and idyllic as George Washington's love and wooing of Martha Custis was, and marriage followed a short engagement, so did Baron Maximilian Washington, a young officer of the Bavarian army, fall

in love with the Duchess Elizabeth Marie Frederica, sister of the reigning Grand Duke of Oldenburg. His subsequent marriage proved that real love can surmount obstacles of every kind, even those of unequal birth or of royal blood. George Washington himself had knowledge of the existence of his Dutch cousins, and exchanged at different periods of his life courtesies with his relatives in Rotterdam.

Or was it not oversight? Were the Dutch and German Washingtons overlooked purposely, after careful deliberations? Perhaps the American historians did not wish to connect the name of the Father of the Republic closely with the family whose members had played and were playing an important part in the aristocratic social life of Europe, and who were officers in the German and Austrian armies. Or they may not have cared to make it widely public that a branch of the Washington family can be found in the Book of Barons of the *Almanach de Gotha* and even in the *Almanach de Gotha* itself among the morgantic marriages of the reigning house of Oldenburg.

However it happened that the Dutch and German Washingtons are unknown to the American public, their existence was revealed in the year 1862 to William Murphy, then American Consul in Frankfort-on-the Main, and related to the New York Historical Society by Frederick Kapp, a noted lawyer, politician and historian of the early seventies. The New York Historical Society preserves in its archives the complete genealogy of his family, enumerating all the direct descendants from father to son, from James Washington down to those who are alive at present, gathered from the original sources in Germany, Austria and the Netherlands. Mr. Kapp undertook all the research work, and presented many interesting letters pertaining to his work to the Historical Society. It was at the time that the Civil War was raging in America. Enthusiasts for the cause of the Union or of the Confederates came from all parts of the world to join the respective armies. Germany, where the spirit of 1848 still prevailed, had sent thousands of men who helped to fight for the Union. The American consuls in foreign countries were authorized to secure the services of promising men and to assist them in their endeavor to cross the ocean and join the American armies.

One day, in the summer of 1862, there strolled into the office of Consul Murphy, at Frankfort, a young gentleman who was desirous of coming to the United States and entering her volunteer army. He

called in order to obtain information about the conditions of joining our forces and of obtaining a commission therein. He had been a lieutenant in the Bavarian army and showed by his accent and manners that he was a south German. For some cause or other he finally gave up his intention. At the above interview he mentioned as an inducement for his acceptance, that he was the namesake and a distant relative of the greatest American. When asked for his name the young man, who seemed little over twenty years of age, called himself the Baron de Washington and to prove his claims to that name produced a pedigree written partly in Dutch and partly in German, of that branch of the Washington family to which he belonged. This pedigree was given later on by Mr. Murphy to Mr. Kapp for the purpose of presenting it to the New York Historical Society. It goes back to the middle of the seventeenth century, to James Washington, brother of General Washington's great-grandfather, John. James, as early as the year 1650, went to Holland, while John, with his brother Andrew, emigrated in 1656 to Virginia. James Washington settled in Rotterdam, where he married Clara van der Lanen, daughter of the then burgomaster of that port and the richest merchant of the city. He had five children, the oldest and youngest of whom were boys. The oldest, Samuel, died unmarried, while Jacob, the youngest, had a son of the same name born in 1689, and who in 1724 married Maria Wyantz. From him the continental Washingtons descended.

While it may be taken as a general rule that families after having flourished for three generations subsequently decline, an exception appears in favor of the European branch of the Washington family, for it improved with every succeeding generation. Thus Jacob was justice of the peace at Rotterdam, his three sons became civil and military officers in the service of the Netherlands, and one of his grandsons, also called Jacob, born in 1778 and died in 1848, was made a lieutenant general in the Bavarian army, and, having been created a baron, married a titled lady of Bavaria. The youngest of his sons was the young man who wished to enter the American army. His brother Maximilian married the Duchess of Oldenburg and in this way became connected with one of the oldest families of Europe. The house of Oldenburg is the main branch of the Holstein-Gottorp stock and has given emperors to Russia, kings to Denmark, and is now connected with the English throne by Queen Mother Alexandra.

Although the Dutch branch is not so highly connected, it nevertheless occupies a prominent position in its country. Jacob Washington, another great-grandson of the first Jacob, died in 1845 at Sourabaya, Java, while a first lieutenant in the Dutch navy, and his sister, Johanna Cornelia, married Cornelius L. Keurenaar, a wealthy banker at The Hague.

The Dutch Washingtons, as late as the middle of the last century, were consistent members of the English church of Holland, but the German branch, in consequence probably of the marriage of Jacob to a member of the Bavarian high aristocracy of Catholic faith, adhered to that church.

Jacob Washington had left the Netherlands, his native country, about 1800. He had travelled extensively in France, in those years at the zenith of the Napoleonic empire. He had received a military education in his own country and had always taken a vital interest in the militarism of the countries he visited. A short stay in Prussia made him a sympathizer with the countries under the French yoke. A visit to the estate of a Bavarian friend and a prolonged stay in Munich were followed by his decision to take service in the Bavarian army. He combined high military qualities with remarkable talent for organizing military bodies in a short time. His decisive actions in important battles won him recognition from the King. He was made Baron, acted as adjutant to the King of Bavaria, and is referred to as "organizer" of the Bavarian army. His son, Jacobus, also, an officer in the Bavarian army, married a Baroness von Verger, lady-in-waiting to the Queen of Bavaria. The king himself was a godfather to his first-born child, Maximilian, the hero of a love affair that furnished gossip and talk to the courts of Europe and strengthened in the people the belief that real love is stronger than etiquette and more potential than tradition.

Baron Maximilian Washington had been educated at a military academy. He had had a few years of active service as officer of a provincial regiment. For years he had not visited Bavaria's capital, Munich. At Christmas, 1854, he arrived in Munich to spend the holidays with his family and to be introduced at court. The Duchess Frederica of Oldenburg was at the same time in the city, the guest of the royal household.

While later on in official accounts of their subsequent marriage

the story was circulated that the Baron met the Duchess at a reception at court, that he was ordered to dance with her, and the two learned during the conversation and at other following meetings to love each other, a different and probably truthful account of their first meeting is given in contemporary Viennese papers. It was two days before Christmas. The streets were lined with bustling merry shoppers. The stores were crowded with happy men and women selecting presents; snow was falling and the little white crystals gathered in small and big heaps on the roadway that seemed to be covered with powdered sugar. Among the throngs was the Duchess Frederica. Like any other woman she was loaded down with parcels, trying to make her way through the excited crowd. She seemed to enjoy the crisp winter morning and the busy life around her. Baron Washington, emerging from a store where he had made a purchase, espied the pretty woman in handsome furs with red, healthy cheeks and eyes that seemed to dance with happy enjoyment. Was it simple gallantry that induced him to break through the crowd, to hasten to her side and to offer his services? Or was it love at first sight as their eyes met and an unexplainable something induced him to speak to the strange woman that attracted him?

The Christmas spirit seemed to have taken possession of her. She permitted him to carry her parcels and to escort her "home." After he learned that this "home" was the royal palace and his new acquaintance a princess visiting the royal family he felt rather embarrassed. But Frederica seemed to like the idea, to "have been spoken to on the street" by a daring "masher," and promised to select him as a dancer at a court ball where both expected to be present. They met frequently, and were engaged before they started for their respective homes. The Grand Duke of Oldenburg, induced by the determination of his sister and the intercession of the King of Bavaria in favor of Baron Washington, finally sanctioned their marriage, which was celebrated on the 15th of August of the same year. Baron Carl Theodore Washington, who wished to enter the American army in 1862, re-entered in the year 1863 the Bavarian army. He married in 1893 a countess of Butler-Heimhausen, a member of one of the most prominent Catholic aristocratic houses of Austria. He had been chamberlain to the King of Bavaria and lieutenant colonel in his army. He died in 1897. His widow plays an important part in the court life of Munich and Vienna. She erected to the memory of her husband a hospital in the

city of Heimhausen called the Washington Hospital and a poorhouse and orphan asylum in Vienna, also bearing the name of her husband.

A son of this couple received a commission as lieutenant in the Austrian army two years ago. He was one of the first victims of Montenegrins on the Dalmatian border in the year 1912. Baron Peter E. I. K. George, a younger brother of Carl Theodore, is doing at present active duty in the Austrian army on the Russian frontier. He is commander of a squadron of Austrian dragoons.

A Baron Jacob Washington, general in the Bavarian army, chamberlain to the king and commander of an infantry brigade, died several months ago, shortly before the war broke out. On the occasion of his death a family gathering of the Dutch and the German Washingtons was held and revealed that there are at present thirty-six male members of the family living.

The family Keurenaar-Washington, direct descendants of Sourabaya Jacob Washington, commander of the Dutch army, are the representatives of the Dutch branch of the Washington family. Cornelius L. Keurenaar-Washington, one of the best known bankers in The Hague, is in possession of the original family register, dating back to James Washington, and of letters that were received by his ancestors from his brothers John and Andrew shortly after their arrival in Virginia. Three of his sons are officers in the Dutch army, while five of his nephews joined the navy. His father-in-law is rear-admiral and well liked by his Queen.

The German as well as the Dutch members of the European branch of the Washington family know that they can count among their ancestors the first President of the United States, and are proud of this fact, as can be seen in an autobiography of Baron Jacob Washington, published in 1840, where his relationship is pointed out and referred to many times.

GUIDO BRUNO

New York Press

LINCOLN AS A POLITICIAN

An unpublished letter of Abraham Lincoln, written before his nomination for the Presidency, is interesting as showing him in the light of a politician. In this letter he writes:

Springfield, Ill., April 6th, 1860.

Hon. R. M. Corwin:

My Dear Sir—Reaching home yesterday after an absence of more than two weeks, I found your letter of the 24th of March. Remembering that when not a very great man begins to be mentioned for a very great position, his head is very likely to be a little turned, I concluded I am not the fittest person to answer the questions you ask. Making due allowance for this, I think Mr. Seward is the very best candidate we could have for the North of Illinois, and the very *worst* for the South of it. The estimate of Gov. Chace here is neither better nor worse than that of Seward, except that he is a newer man. They are regarded as being almost the same, seniority giving Seward the inside track.

Mr. Bates, I think, would be the best man for the South of our state, and the worst for the North of it. If Judge McLean was fifteen, or even ten years younger, I think he would be stronger than either, in our state, taken as a whole; but his great age, and the recollection of the deaths of Harrison and Taylor have, so far, prevented his being much spoken of here.

I really believe we can carry the state for either of them, or for anyone who may be nominated; but doubtless it would be easier to do it with some than with others.

I feel myself disqualified to speak of myself in this matter. I feel this letter will be of little value to you; but I can make it no better, under the circumstances. Let it be strictly confidential, not that there is anything really objectionable in it, but because it might be misconstrued.

Yours very truly,

A. LINCOLN

THE TRENT AFFAIR

IN November, 1861, the country had been on tenter-hooks, so to speak, for twelve entire months, and during the last six of those months one mortification and failure had followed sharp on another. The community, in a state of the highest possible tension, was constantly hoping for a successful *coup* somewhere and by someone executed in its behalf. It longed for a man who would do, taking the responsibility of the doing. While it was in this state of mind, the telegraph one day announced that the United States sloop-of-war *San Jacinto*, under the command of Captain Charles Wilkes, had arrived at Fortress Monroe, having on board the two Confederate envoys, Mason and Slidell, taken on the high seas from the British mail steamer *Trent*. At last the hour seemed come and with it a man. By one now seeking an explanation of what then occurred, all this must be borne in mind.

Thus worked up to the highest pitch of excitement, the feeling of the country had also been slowly fermenting to one of acute hostility towards Great Britain; and this for two reasons. In the first place, it had seemed as if, in view of its anti-slavery preaching during the last thirty years, and its somewhat Pharisaic, better-than-thou attitude towards America as respects the negro and his condition, Great Britain had failed to evince that sympathy towards us which was expected because of the slaveholders' rebellion, and had, to say the least, done nothing to forward the cause of the Union in a crisis brought on by the aggressive action of the South. On the contrary, the attitude of England in general had been sneering as well as adversely critical; and the tone of the London *Times*, in particular—for the *Times*, still known as "The Thunderer", was recognized as the first and most influential newspaper in the world—had been distinctly unsympathetic, not to say antagonistic, and otherwise acutely irritating.* William H. Russell, the famous Crimean War correspondent, was also at that time in this country, and his letters regularly appearing in the *Times*

—In expanded form, with some seventy pages of supporting documents, this paper will appear in the next volume of the *Proceedings of the Massachusetts Historical Society*. We quote it from *The American Historical Review*.

*See Extra No. 37 of the MAGAZINE for an interesting summary of the *Times*' attitude in 1861-65.—[ED.]

as "from our Special Correspondent", were republished and read in America to an extent which can hardly now be understood. Anxiously waited for, and printed *in extenso* in all the leading journals, extracts from them were to be found in every paper in the land. Russell had been to a certain extent present at Bull Run, and a witness of our disgrace. While his account of what he saw on that occasion was photographic and strictly correct, we none the less had become morbidly conscious that there was "a chiel amang [us] taking notes", and the "notes" he took when seen in "prent" caused a degree of irritation at this day difficult to describe or overstate. Thus morbidly excited and intensely sensitive, the country was in a thoroughly unreasoning and altogether unreasonable condition, very necessary now to emphasize; for it needed only the occurrence of some accident to lead to a pronounced explosion of what can only be described as Anglophobia. Discouraged, we had in fact only begun to settle down to the conviction that a long and uncertain struggle was before us. With all conditions, therefore, explosive, so to speak, in character, the incident of the *Trent* came like a bolt from a clouded and lowering sky; but it was a shell exploding in a powder magazine rather than a spark falling in a mass of combustible matter.

The course of events, briefly stated, was as follows: Immediately after the firing upon Fort Sumter, Jefferson Davis, president of the then newly organized Confederate States, had sent out to Europe agents to forward the interests of the proposed nationality. These agents had there spent some seven months, accomplishing little. Disappointed at their failure, Davis determined upon a second and more formal mission. The new representatives were designated as "Special Commissioners of the Confederate States of America, near the Government" whether of Great Britain or of France, as the case might be. James Murray Mason of Virginia and John Slidell of Louisiana were selected, the first-named for London, the second for Paris. Both, it will be remembered, had recently been senators of the United States, Slidell having withdrawn from the Senate February 4, 1861, immediately after the passage of the Ordinance of Secession by the state of Louisiana; while Mason, having absented himself about March 20, during the session of the Senate for executive business, did not again take his seat. Virginia seceded April 17, and Mason, together with several other Southern senators, was in his absence expelled by formal vote (July 11) at the special session of the Thirty-Seventh Congress,

which met under the call of President Lincoln, July 4, 1861. Probably no two men in the entire South were more thoroughly obnoxious to those of the Union side than Mason and Slidell. The first was, in many and by no means the best ways, a typical Virginian. Very provincial and intensely arrogant, his dislike of New England, and especially of Massachusetts, was pronounced, and exceeded only by his contempt. Slidell, on the other hand, an intriguer by nature, unscrupulous in his political methods, was generally looked upon as the most dangerous person to the Union the Confederacy could select for diplomatic work in Europe. Their first object was to secure the recognition of the Confederacy. The ports of the Confederate States were then blockaded; but the blockade had not yet become really effective. They selected Charleston as their port of embarkation, and October 12 as its date. The night of the 12th was dark and rainy, but with little or no wind, conditions altogether favorable for their purpose. They left Charleston on the little Confederate steamer *Theodora*, evaded the blockading squadron, and reached Nassau, New Providence, two days later, the 14th. It had been their intention to take passage for Europe at Nassau on an English steamer; but, failing to find one which did not stop at New York, the *Theodora* continued her voyage to Cardenas in Cuba, whence the envoys and those accompanying them proceeded overland to Havana. Arriving at Havana about the 22d of October, they remained there until the 7th of November. They then embarked on the British steamer *Trent*, its captain having full knowledge of their diplomatic capacity as envoys of an insurgent community, and giving consent to their embarkation. The *Trent* was a British mail packet, making regular trips between Vera Cruz, Mexico, and the Danish island of St. Thomas. She was in no respect a blockade-runner; was not engaged in commerce with any American port; and was then on a regular voyage from a port in Mexico, by way of Havana, to her advertised destination, St. Thomas, all neutral ports. At St. Thomas direct connection could be made with a line of British steamers running to Southampton. The envoys, therefore, when they left Havana, were on a neutral mail steamer, sailing under the British flag, on a scheduled voyage between neutral points.

At just that time the *San Jacinto*, a first-class screw sloop mounting fifteen guns, was returning from the west coast of Africa, where for twenty months she had been part of the African squadron engaged in suppressing the slave-trade. She was commanded by Captain Wilkes,

who had recently joined her. Returning by way of the Cape Verde Islands, he there learned from the newspapers about the last of September of the course of public events in the United States, and rumors reached him of Confederate privateers, as they were then called, destroying American vessels in West India waters. He determined to make an effort at the capture of some of them. On October 10 the *San Jacinto* reached the port of St. Thomas, and subsequently touched at Cienfuegos on the south coast of Cuba. There her Captain learned, also from the newspapers, that the Confederate envoys were at that time at Havana, and about to take passage for Southampton. Reaching Havana on the 28th of October, he further learned that they were to embark on the *Trent*, and leave Havana on the 7th of November. He then conceived the design of intercepting the *Trent*, exercising the right of search, and making prisoners of the envoys. No question as to his right to stop, board, and search the *Trent* seems to have entered his mind. He did, however, take into his confidence his executive officer, Lieutenant Fairfax, disclosing to him his project. Lieutenant Fairfax entered, it is said, a vigorous protest against the proposed action, and strongly urged on his Captain the necessity of proceeding with great caution unless he wished to provoke international difficulties, and not impossibly a war with Great Britain. He then suggested that his commanding officer consult an American judge at Key West, an authority on maritime law; which, however, Captain Wilkes declined to do. Leaving Key West on November 5, Captain Wilkes directed the course of the *San Jacinto* to the Bahama Channel, through which the *Trent* would necessarily pass on its way to St. Thomas, and there stationed himself. About noon on the 8th, the *Trent* hove in sight, and when she had approached sufficiently near the *San Jacinto*, a round shot was fired athwart her course; the United States flag was run up at the mast-head at the same time. The approaching vessel showed the English colors, but did not check her speed or indicate a disposition to heave to. Accordingly, a few instants later, a shell from the *San Jacinto* was exploded across her bows. This had the desired effect. The *Trent* immediately stopped, and a boat from the *San Jacinto* proceeded to board her. It is unnecessary to go into the details of what then occurred. For present purposes it is sufficient to say that the two envoys, together with their secretaries, were identified and forcibly removed, being taken on board the *San Jacinto*; which, without interfering with the mails or otherwise subjecting the *Trent* to search, then

laid its course for Fortress Monroe. Arriving there on the 15th, news of the capture was immediately flashed over the country. The *Trent* on the other hand, proceeded to St. Thomas, where her passengers were transferred to another steamer, and completed the voyage to Southampton. They arrived and the report of the transaction was made public in Great Britain November 27, twelve days after the arrival of the *San Jacinto* at Fortress Monroe, and the publication of the news of the arrest in the United States.

While a storm of enthusiastic approval was sweeping over the northern part of the United States in the twelve days between November 15 and November 27, a storm of indignation of quite equal intensity swept over Great Britain between November 27 and the close of the year.* Most fortunately there was no ocean cable in those days, and the movement of the Atlantic steamers was comparatively slow. Accordingly the first intimations of the commotion caused in Great Britain did not reach America until the arrival of the *Hansa* at New York, December 12. Strange as it now seems, therefore, almost an entire month had elapsed between the arrival of the *San Jacinto* at Fortress Monroe (November 15) and the receipt in America (December 12) of any information as to the effect of the seizure of the envoys on the British temper. A most important fact to be now borne in mind.

In reading the accounts of what occurred in America, and seeing the recorded utterances of persons whose names carried authority, it is now most curious to observe the confusion of idea which seemed to exist as to the principles of international law involved, and the apparent utter inability of all concerned to exercise their reason to the extent of preserving consistency of thought or action. Seen through the perspective of fifty years, it may now with reasonable assurance be as-

*Two exceptionally well-informed Americans, long resident in Great Britain, then wrote, the one from London to Mr. Seward, and the other from Edinburgh to his uncle, a citizen of New York: "There never was within memory such a burst of feeling as has been created by the news of the boarding of the [Trent]. The people are frantic with rage, and were the country polled, I fear that 999 men out of a thousand would declare for immediate war. Lord Palmerston cannot resist the impulse if he would"; the other, under the same date, November 29: "The excitement consequent upon the insult to the British flag by the U. S. Frigate, *San Jacinto*, has entirely monopolized the public mind. I have never seen so intense a feeling of indignation exhibited in my life. It pervades all classes, and may make itself heard above the wiser theories of the Cabinet officers." *Official Records of the War*, second series, II. 1107, 1131.

served that, in the controversy which ensued, the United States did not have, and never had, in reality, a justifying leg to stand upon, and least of all was there any possible justification for the course pursued by Captain Wilkes. In the first place, Wilkes, commanding a United States ship-of-war, had not been in communication with his government for months. He had received no instructions; he was not even officially advised of the existence of a blockade; and only through the newspapers and current gossip did he know of the attitude his own government had assumed towards the so-called Confederacy. According to his own statement subsequently made, he did have some treatises on international law in the cabin of the *San Jacinto*, and he consulted them.* From these he satisfied himself that accredited envoys were "contraband"; but he ignored the fact that the Confederacy had not been recognized by the United States government, or by any foreign government, and that the so-called "envoys" were merely "private gentlemen of distinction", citizens of certain states then in insurgency,

*"When I heard at Cienfuegos on the south side of Cuba of these commissioners having landed on the Island of Cuba and that they were at Havana and would depart in the English steamer on the 7th of November, I determined to intercept them and carefully examined all the authorities on international law to which I had access, viz., Kent, Wheaton and Vattel, besides various decisions of Sir William Scott and other judges of the admiralty court of Great Britain which bore upon the rights of neutrals and their responsibilities." Official report of Captain Wilkes to Secretary of the Navy. *Official Records*, second series, II. 1098.

The quite unintelligible and somewhat ludicrous state of what is termed Law, of the international variety, so far as the topic here in question is concerned, is presented in a concrete shape in Moore's *Digest*, VII. 768-779. The authorities are there cited and the discussions of the *Trent* precedent referred to. The difficulty seems to arise from the attempt seriously made to apply the principles laid down by Vattel, etc., and the precedents established by Lord Stowell to present conditions. The existence of modern lines of common-carrier transportation of passengers, merchandise, and mails under neutral flags between points not actually blockaded—lines like the Peninsular and Oriental, the Cunard and the White Star—seems not to have occurred to the publicists; while in fact the applying to the ships of such lines the rules under which Captain Wilkes thought he proceeded, and the application of which Mr. Seward afterwards gravely discussed, is hardly less opposed to reason and common-sense than would be the attitude and efforts of a tailor who endeavored to adjust the dress of a seven-year-old boy to the body and limbs of the same boy when grown to be a man of unprecedented size. In each case the attempt is, or would be, unfortunate, and lead inevitably to results unexpected if not impossible. This apparently is the one real lesson the world derived from the *Trent* affair. It seems to be questionable, however, whether either the statesmen at the time took in the fact or the publicists since have realized it, and the consequent utter futility of what they attempted. Let the investigator substitute *Lusitania* for *Trent*, and consider what would necessarily result.

trying to effect a transit to foreign countries. They were unquestionably embarked under a neutral flag, upon a mail steamer making its regular passage from one neutral port to another. Nevertheless, *pro hac vice*, Commodore Wilkes invested the envoys in question with an official character which his government distinctly refused to allow them, and then proceeded, on the assumption that ambassadors were "embodied despatches", to exercise on the high seas a right of search of a most questionable character; and, in so doing, he further constituted himself, in the person of his subordinate, a prize court, adjudicating on the deck of a neutral ship forcibly halted in its passage as to what personages should be seized, what persons and property should be exempted from seizure, as to how far the process of search should be carried, and generally what course under the conditions given should be pursued. Accordingly, while forcible possession was taken of the persons of the two envoys, no inquiry whatever was made as to their despatch bags, which, when the purpose of the procedure was suspected, had been handed over by the commissioners to the British mail agent, and been by him deposited in his mail-room. They were subsequently in due course delivered to the agents of the Confederacy in England.

Personally, I have a vivid recollection of the day when the news of the seizure was flashed to Boston, and hurriedly placarded on the newspaper bulletin-boards.* A youthful legal practitioner, I was then a man of twenty-six. I had studied, or made an at least honest pretense of so doing, in the office of Richard H. Dana, jr. Mr. Dana was deemed as high an authority on maritime law as there was at the American bar. Reading the announcement on the bulletin-board, I hurried up to his office, and communicated the startling news. Well do I remember his reception of it. His face lighted up, and, clapping his hands with satisfaction over the tidings, he expressed his emphatic approval of the act, adding that he would risk his "professional reputation" on its legality. And this was the view universally expressed and generally accepted.

The *San Jacinto*, was, for various reasons, ordered to proceed at

*Saturday, November 16. On the afternoon of that day the following despatch was sent from Washington: "The intelligence of the capture of Slidell and Mason has diffused the greatest possible joy among all the citizens, including the Government officials from the President down to the humblest messenger."

once to New York, and thence to Boston, there to deliver her prisoners for safe-keeping. Captain Wilkes anchored his ship in Boston Harbor on the 24th of November, and two days later a banquet was given him and his officers at the Revere House, the Hon. J. Wiley Edmands presiding. Mr. Edmands, prominent among the solid business men of Boston of that period, lived at Newton and was treasurer of the Pacific Mills; a Webster Whig in politics, he had been a member of the Thirty-third Congress. The speakers on this occasion seemed to vie with each other in establishing a record from which thereafter it would be impossible to escape. For instance, John A. Andrew, then governor of Massachusetts, a man really great but of somewhat impulsive disposition, had been present in the office of the Secretary of the Navy when the news of the seizure came in. Literally swept off his feet, he had then sprung upon a chair and been prominent in the tumult of cheering which followed the announcement. He now at this banquet declared that the act of Captain Wilkes had shown "not only wise judgment, but (was marked by) manly and heroic success." He referred to it as "one of the most illustrious services that had made the war memorable"; and then most unnecessarily capped the climax of indiscretion by declaring to a delighted audience "that there might be nothing left (in the episode to) crown the exultation of the American heart, Commodore Wilkes fired his shot across the bows of the ship that bore the British Lion at its head." On the same occasion George T. Bigelow, then Chief Justice of Massachusetts, committed himself to an almost though not quite similar extent. First he voiced the very prevalent feeling already referred to, saying: "In common with all loyal men of the North, I have been sighing, for the last six months, for some one who would be willing to say to himself, 'I will take the responsibility'; and who would not only say this, but when the opportunity offered would take the responsibility." He then went on to declare that "Commodore Wilkes acted more from the noble instincts of his patriotic heart, than from any sentence he read from a law book"; adding that, under such circumstances, "a man does not want to ask counsel, or to consult judges upon his duty; his heart, his instinct, tells him what he ought to do". Well might the London *Times* in commenting on the affair observe shortly after, "These are wild words from lawyers." Captain Wilkes then, in language indicative of singular confusion of thought, said that before he had decided on his course, he had examined the authorities, and satisfied himself that these so-called

envoys had none of the rights attaching to such functionaries when properly appointed; and, concluding that it was within his function to capture written despatches, assumed consequently that he had a right to take from under a neutral flag personages of distinction as the embodiment of despatches.*

At Washington the Secretary of the Navy next addressed a congratulatory letter to Captain Wilkes on the "great public service" he had rendered, giving to his proceeding the "emphatic approval of this department". He, however, took pains to insist that the forbearance of the commander of the *San Jacinto* in this instance in not seizing the *Trent* and sending it into port for adjudication by a prize court "must by no means be permitted to constitute a precedent hereafter for the treatment of any case of similar infraction of neutral obligations". In his annual official report a few days later, Secretary Welles further stated that the "prompt and decisive action of Captain Wilkes on this occasion merited and received emphatic approval". On Monday, December 2, Congress assembled, and before the close of the first day's session Mr. Lovejoy, of Illinois, offered a joint resolution thanking Captain Wilkes, "for his brave, adroit and patriotic conduct in the arrest and detention of the traitors, James M. Mason and John Slidell". This resolution was passed by a unanimous vote; and, furthermore, the President was requested to present to Captain Wilkes "a gold medal with suitable emblems and devices, in testimony of the high sense entertained by Congress of his good conduct", etc.† As to the irresponsible outpourings and journalistic utterances of those delirious three weeks, it is no exaggeration to say that, read to-day, they are more suggestive of the incoherences of the inmates of an insane asylum than of any well-considered expression of the organs of a sober and policed community—a community which only half a century before had gone to war in defense of the great principles of immunity from ocean search and seamen's rights.

*An account of the banquet will be found in the *Boston Evening Transcript*, November 27, 1861.

†*Official Records*, second series, II. 1113.

BOSTON

CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS

(*To be continued*)

(The recent death of Mr. Adams lends especial interest to his valuable paper.—ED.)

